



AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement formal drawings for Figs. 1, 2, 6-8, 11-13, 15, 19 and 20 have been filed concurrently.

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to make editorial changes thereto and generally improve the form thereof, and a substitute specification and abstract are provided. No new matter has been added by the substitute specification and abstract.

Initially, replacement formal drawings have been provided for Figs. 1, 2, 6-8, 11-13, 15, 19 and 20. The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 1 differs from Fig. 1 as filed by having deleted therefrom reference numeral "21" and its lead line. The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 2 differs from Fig. 2 as filed by substituting --13-- for "31", by adding reference numerals --6a--, --6b--, --6c-- and --6d--, and by deleting the leftmost reference numeral "6". The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 6 differs from Fig. 6 as filed by having deleted therefrom reference numeral "21" and its lead line. The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 7 differs from Fig. 7 as filed by substituting --13-- for "31". The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 8 differs from Fig. 8 as filed by substituting --13-- for "31". The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 11 differs from Fig. 11 as filed by substituting --13-- for "31". The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 12 differs from Fig. 12 as filed by substituting --13-- for "31". The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 13 differs from Fig. 13 as filed by having deleted therefrom reference numeral "21" and its lead line. The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 15 differs from Fig. 15 as filed by having deleted therefrom reference numeral "21" and its lead line. The replacement formal drawing for Fig. 19 differs from Fig. 19 as filed by being labeled as --Prior Art-- and by having deleted therefrom reference numeral "21" and its lead line. And, the replacement formal drawing for Fig. 20 differs from Fig. 20 as filed by being labeled as --Prior Art-- and by substituting --13-- for "31".

The replacement formal drawings are believed to obviate the drawing objections expressed by the Examiner.

The objection to claim 17 is noted, but is believed to be in error since claim 17 does further limit claim 12. Specifically, claim 12 recites a variation in thickness, whereas claim 17 refers to an absolute thickness. A variation in thickness of an object is not necessarily reflective of an absolute thickness of the object, and accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 does further limit claim 12, whereby the objection to claim 17 (now claim 39) should not be maintained.

In reply to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 12-17, the specification has been amended (page 7, lines 15-25 of the marked-up specification) so as to provide antecedent support for the subject matter of claims 12-17.

By the current Amendment, claims 1-31 have been canceled and claims 32-53 have been added. The new independent claims, i.e. claims 32 and 48-53 correspond to former claims 1 and 19-24, respectively, while including an additional limitation that **the edge is made of a foamed resin including both an independent foam and a continuous foam**. This limitation was previously found in claims 2 and 3, and accordingly, the rejection of claims 2 and 3 will be discussed as it pertains to the newly presented claims.

In rejecting claims 2 and 3, the Examiner relied upon a combination of Espiritu and Takahashi. Specifically, the Examiner recognized that Espiritu does not disclose an edge made of a foamed resin including an independent foam and continuous foam, and thus relied upon Takahashi for remedying this deficiency of Espiritu. In this regard, the Examiner directed Applicants' attention to paragraph [0019] of Takahashi for a teaching of a foamed resin including an independent foam and a continuous foam. This portion of Takahashi and Takahashi in its entirety has been studied, and nowhere does Takahashi disclose or suggest a foamed resin including an independent foam and a continuous foam.

In this regard, paragraph [0014] of Takahashi states,

since the polyimide foam material is a continuous foam material having an independent foam ratio of *one percent or less*, it is possible to mold the foam material into...material...having a predetermined thickness and then to pressure mold the foam...into a loudspeaker diaphragm.

This clearly indicates that the intent of Takahashi is to employ a foamed resin including only a continuous foam and **not** a foamed resin including both an independent foam and a continuous foam.

The remaining references do not resolve this deficiency of Takahashi, and accordingly, each of the independent claims is allowable over the references relied upon by the Examiner either taken alone or in combination, whereby claims 32-53 are allowable.


In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinya TABATA et al.

By:



Joseph M. Gorski
Registration No. 46,500
Attorney for Applicants

JMG/nka
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 28, 2006